preme Court, U.S.
FILED

021390 DEC 24 2002

No._____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

NICOLE LOREN et. al

Petitioner,

v.

CHARLES M SASSER JR
HERNANDO BEACH INC.
HERNANDO BEACH SOUTH
PROPERTY OWNERS ASSN et. al

Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Pro-se Litigant
NICOLE LOREN
8219 W. ADDISON ST
CHICAGO ,ILLINOIS 60634
(773)589-1422

5 IFP

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1.Whether a deed restricted subdivision must accommodate handicapped individuals under fair housing statues beyond allowances in the property owners regulations Petitioner respectfully ask this court to review case de novo under Townes Assoc Ltdv City of Greenville 226 Sct 81,86,221 SE 2nd 773,775 (1996)This case ruling is in conflict with other appeal and supreme court decisions

2.Whether constitutional challenges under 42 USC &1983 right to proceed under property rights. The petitioners' right to protect private property under United States and Florida Constitution against the Florida Home Owners Chapter The conflict between 1981 v 1982,1983 under the United States and Florida Constitution Article 1 Section 10 as in Steven Siegel, Article: The Constitution and Private Government ;Toward the Recognition of Constitutional Rights in Private Residential Communities Fifty Years after Marsh v Alabama ,"6 Wm & Mary Bill of Rts.J.461-465(1998)

3.Whether Respondents violated Fair Housing Statue

4 Whether Petitioners had a right to proceed under the Constitution to address their grievances in a court of law as filed in federal complaint under the civil rights act deprived of ,handicapped rights, human rights, the right to form as other homeowner in the community .42 USC1983 -2000(d) bound by XIV sec 1,2 IV sec 1

5.Whether this court could resolve the issue of state action and inter circuit conflict of preliminary injunction. Whether petitioner as a free citizen of the United States had free speech right under the first and fourteenth amendment of the constitution in this community. Whether petitioner's were deprived of their rights

6.What is the intent of congress under fair housing 42 USC3604 term "injury "whether includes personal injury whether it is under statutory or traditional negligence Whether personal injury would best be addressed under civil rights or ADA .References made on notes of the Commission On Human Relation State of Florida Administration file whether this a ADA case.

7.Whether this court can give guidance on liability it has been a consent struggle all parties and insurance company claim no liability on any count in federal complaint and issues of agency theory liability ,association successor ,civil right liability

8 .Whether medical payment should be reimbursed to state and federal government under 42 USC2651,2653

9.The intent of congress for legal protection under 42 USC 6000-01 developmental disabled and family members on a community base social security waiver program ,equal protection under each program and same legal protection for same class person with mental disabilities and 42 USC6010,42 USC10801 or legal protection or 42 USC1988
10.Whether the motion was properly granted to suppress medical records and medical condition and medical expert testimony with respondents cited cases and case law
11. Whether the motion was properly granted to dismiss Charles M Sasser Jr and Hernando Beach South Property Owners Association with respondents cited cases and case law Petitioner feel that it sends the wrong message as to the duty of fair housing statue

12 Whether granting motion was properly granted to dismiss counsel two week before jury trial ,no hearing or consent of client ,with lien on case ,
Petitioners seek information on civil right attorney fee act and review of lien and this court review of granting motion to exclude unauthorized and unlicensed practice of law with cited cases in the middle of a jury trial leaving a blind severe developmental person where there is a competency issue in courtroom without legal counsel for legal protection or a person to speak on her behalf for handicapped rights to be heard .
.Petitioner feels that could cause default of any legal decision in this case. Petitioner asked lower court to appoint counsel.
13Whether jury instruction were correct in this case all people are equal ,no exception for handicap and must find discrimination intent given instruction without allowing pretext evidence ,was enough evidence allowed given the fact the jury was only allowed to hear information on design of blueprints, or no other facts of the case allowed by lower court for that finding. Does plaintiff have to prove discrimination intent under 3604 fair housing act or rather that they violated A or B of fair housing creating a discriminatory act ,Whether verdict form was correctly applied stating modern accommodation with a undue hardship for the handicap family

LIST OF PARTIES

A list of all parties to the proceeding in this petition is as follows; Petitioner Plaintiff Nicole Loren overall caretaker ,Florida Health Care Surrogate with Special Power Of Attorney residing with Mother Bettie J Newbold handicapped, injured person and Charlene Janke Aunt Blind Developmental person ,injured persons in this case. Respondents Defendants Charles M Sasser Jr and Hernando Bch Inc counsel Thomas S Hogan Jr of The Hogan Law Firm and Frank Miller of Caglianone & Miller Esquire for Auto Owners Insurance Co for Charles M Sasser Jr Developer and Hernando Bch Inc Developer Firm Florida Profit Corporation Counsel J Robert Mc Cormack of Persante and Mc Cormack Esquire for Hernando Beach South Property Owners Assn Florida Non profit Corporation Other Counsel A Wade James Esquire for Auto Owners Insurance located Lansing Michigan not on record ,not party in case but relates to medical bills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED..... i,iii

LIST OF PARTIES.....iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....vii, xx

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....1,2

STATEMENT.....3,14

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....14,17

I A. This Decision Below Is Wrong In Conflict With Other Appeal And Supreme Court And Reflect Widespread Uncertainty of the Term Reasonable Accommodation. "Ruling That Allows Litigants To Circumvent Important Federal Statue Impairs Stability And Uniformity Of Cases. The Lower Erred On Summary Judgment Order

II B. Challenge Under 42 USC 1983
This Case Raises Constitutional Issue Under United States Article 1 Section 10,This Present The Issue Of Whether A Deed Restricted Subdivision Must Accommodate Handicapped Individuals Under Federal And State Fair Housing Statues Beyond Allowances In Property Owners Regulations As Well As Constitutional

TABLE OF CONTENT.....Continued

Challenge under 42 USC &1983.....,.....17,20

III C. Challenge To First And Fourteenth Amendment Free Speech ,State Action, Conflict In Circuit On Preliminary Injunction.....20,23

IV D. The Suppression Of Medical Records, And Medical Expert Testimony.....23,24

V E. The Intent Of Congress Under Fair Housing for Personal Injury The Term "Injury" This Case Is The First Impression In This Circuit Needing Supervisory Opinion Of This Court It Impact Uninsured Victims Of Injury Of Relief Of Harm Caused By Conduct Under 42USC 3604.....,24,26

VI F. The Intent Of Congress For Legal Protection Under 42 -6000-1 Developmental Person And Family Members 42 USC10801 42 USC6010 ,42 USC 1988 USC 2000D..26,27

VII G. This Court Has So Far Departed From The Accepted Usual Course Of Judicial Proceeding For Federal Fair Housing Discrimination Litigation ,Laws And Procedures Besides Not Allowing Handicapped Proceeding Under A Civil Right Act Case . 27,30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: **[1]** **Page(s)**

Anast v Commonwealth Apartments

956 F Supp 792 (N.D ILL1997).....12

Andrew v Hotel Reed Nursing

167 F Supp 2d 1333(USDC Ala).....26

Applefield v Commercial Standard Ins Co

176 So 2d 366,377 (Fla 2d dca 1965).....11

Auto -Owners Insurance v Dewberry

383 So 2nd 1109 (Fla 1st DCA)1980.....28

Bangerter v Orem Utah

46 F3rd 1491 (10 th cir 1995).....16

Bani v Hud

102 F 31203,1207 (11th Cir 1997).....25

Bauer v State Of Florida

610 So 2d1326(Fla 2d DCA1992).....26

Belber v Lipson

905 S 2nd 549 USCA 1st ID p.62 Id p63.....23

Beyer v North Carolina Division Of Mental Health

2001 W.L 1319506W.D.N.C.....26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[2] Page(s)

Blum v Yaretsky

457 U.S 991 1 led).....14

Borrero v Metro Dade

19 F Supp2d 1318.....21

Broadmoor San Clemente Homeowner Association

30 Cal Rtpr2d 316 (cal 25 App4 Dist 62 ,1994).....17

Brock v Watergate Park

502 So 2d 1380 Fla 4th DCA 1.....23

Casa Marie Inc v Superior Court Of Puerto Rico D

752 F Suppl 1152 ID p.320.....18

Casa Marie v Superior

988 F2d 252 (1st Cir 1993).....18

C.F Indiana v Anderson

303 U 95 100 82 Led 685 ,58 SCR 443 (1938 Id p. 22.....20

Christianson v Colt Industries Operating Corp

486 U.S 800,814-818,108 Sct 2166,2177-2178 Led2d
811(1988).....27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[3] **Page(s)**

City Of Chicago v Matchmaker Real Estate

982 F 2d 1086 (7th Cir 1992).....29

City Of Emonds v Oxford House

514 U.S 725 ,732(1995)replaced by City of Athen
960F2d975(11th Cir).....7

Dan Glickman v Wileman Brother & Elliott

117 SCT 2130 ,138 Led (1997) Id p.7,8.....23

Don 's Porta Sign Inc v City Of Clearwater

829 F2d 1051,1054(11th cir 1987.....22

Dillard v Baldwin

53 F Supp 2d 1266.....21

EEOC v CEC Entertainment

ADA Case 10 No 1593.....25

Elrod v Burns

427 U.S 347,373 96 Sct 2673,,2690,49 Led2d 547 (1976).....23

Evan v Newton
382 U.S 296.....22

Franklin v Gwinnett Public Schools
503 U.S 60 (1992).....24

EDITOR'S NOTE

ORIGINAL PAGINATION IS NOT CONTINUOUS

preme Court, U.S.
FILED

02139 0 DEC 24 2002

No._____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

NICOLE LOREN et. al

Petitioner,

v.

CHARLES M SASSER JR
HERNANDO BEACH INC.
HERNANDO BEACH SOUTH
PROPERTY OWNERS ASSN et. al

Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Pro-se Litigant
NICOLE LOREN
8219 W. ADDISON ST
CHICAGO ,ILLINOIS 60634
(773)589-1422

5 cpp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1.Whether a deed restricted subdivision must accommodate handicapped individuals under fair housing statues beyond allowances in the property owners regulations Petitioner respectfully ask this court to review case de novo under Townes Assoc Ltdv City of Greenville 226 Sct 81,86,221 SE 2nd 773,775 (1996)This case ruling is in conflict with other appeal and supreme court decisions

2.Whether constitutional challenges under 42 USC &1983 right to proceed under property rights. The petitioners' right to protect private property under United States and Florida Constitution against the Florida Home Owners Chapter The conflict between 1981 v 1982,1983 under the United States and Florida Constitution Article 1 Section 10 as in Steven Siegel, Article: The Constitution and Private Government ;Toward the Recognition of Constitutional Rights in Private Residential Communities Fifty Years after Marsh v Alabama ,"6 Wm & Mary Bill of Rts.J.461-465(1998)

3.Whether Respondents violated Fair Housing Statue

4 Whether Petitioners had a right to proceed under the Constitution to address their grievances in a court of law as filed in federal complaint under the civil rights act deprived of ,handicapped rights, human rights, the right to form as other homeowner in the community .42 USC1983 -2000(d) bound by XIV sec 1,2 IV sec 1

5.Whether this court could resolve the issue of state action and inter circuit conflict of preliminary injunction. Whether petitioner as a free citizen of the United States had free speech right under the first and fourteenth amendment of the constitution in this community. Whether petitioner's were deprived of their rights

6.What is the intent of congress under fair housing 42 USC3604 term "injury "whether includes personal injury whether it is under statutory or traditional negligence Whether personal injury would best be addressed under civil rights or ADA .References made on notes of the Commission On Human Relation State of Florida Administration file whether this a ADA case.

7.Whether this court can give guidance on liability it has been a consent struggle all parties and insurance company claim no liability on any count in federal complaint and issues of agency theory liability ,association successor ,civil right liability

8 .Whether medical payment should be reimbursed to state and federal government under 42 USC2651,2653

9.The intent of congress for legal protection under 42 USC 6000-01 developmental disabled and family members on a community base social security waiver program ,equal protection under each program and same legal protection for same class person with mental disabilities and 42 USC6010,42 USC10801 or legal protection or 42 USC1988
10.Whether the motion was properly granted to suppress medical records and medical condition and medical expert testimony with respondents cited cases and case law
11. Whether the motion was properly granted to dismiss Charles M Sasser Jr and Hernando Beach South Property Owners Association with respondents cited cases and case law Petitioner feel that it sends the wrong message as to the duty of fair housing statue

12 Whether granting motion was properly granted to dismiss counsel two week before jury trial ,no hearing or consent of client ,with lien on case ,
Petitioners seek information on civil right attorney fee act and review of lien and this court review of granting motion to exclude unauthorized and unlicensed practice of law with cited cases in the middle of a jury trial leaving a blind severe developmental person where there is a competency issue in courtroom without legal counsel for legal protection or a person to speak on her behalf for handicapped rights to be heard .
.Petitioner feels that could cause default of any legal decision in this case. Petitioner asked lower court to appoint counsel.
13Whether jury instruction were correct in this case all people are equal ,no exception for handicap and must find discrimination intent given instruction without allowing pretext evidence ,was enough evidence allowed given the fact the jury was only allowed to hear information on design of blueprints, or no other facts of the case allowed by lower court for that finding. Does plaintiff have to prove discrimination intent under 3604 fair housing act or rather that they violated A or B of fair housing creating a discriminatory act ,Whether verdict form was correctly applied stating modern accommodation with a undue hardship for the handicap family

LIST OF PARTIES

A list of all parties to the proceeding in this petition is as follows; Petitioner Plaintiff Nicole Loren overall caretaker ,Florida Health Care Surrogate with Special Power Of Attorney residing with Mother Bettie J Newbold handicapped, injured person and Charlene Janke Aunt Blind Developmental person ,injured persons in this case. Respondents Defendants Charles M Sasser Jr and Hernando Bch Inc counsel Thomas S Hogan Jr of The Hogan Law Firm and Frank Miller of Caglianone & Miller Esquire for Auto Owners Insurance Co for Charles M Sasser Jr Developer and Hernando Bch Inc Developer Firm Florida Profit Corporation .Counsel J Robert Mc Cormack of Persante and Mc Cormack Esquire for Hernando Beach South Property Owners Assn Florida Non profit Corporation Other Counsel A Wade James Esquire for Auto Owners Insurance located Lansing Michigan not on record ,not party in case but relates to medical bills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED..... i,iii

LIST OF PARTIES.....iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....vii, xx

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....1,2

STATEMENT.....3,14

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....14,17

I A. This Decision Below Is Wrong In Conflict With Other Appeal And Supreme Court And Reflect Widespread Uncertainty of the Term Reasonable Accommodation. "Ruling That Allows Litigants To Circumvent Important Federal Statue Impairs Stability And Uniformity Of Cases. The Lower Erred On Summary Judgment Order

II B. Challenge Under 42 USC 1983
This Case Raises Constitutional Issue Under United States Article 1 Section 10,This Present The Issue Of Whether A Deed Restricted Subdivision Must Accommodate Handicapped Individuals Under Federal And State Fair Housing Statues Beyond Allowances In Property Owners Regulations As Well As Constitutional

TABLE OF CONTENT.....Continued

Challenge under 42 USC &1983.....,.....17,20

III C. Challenge To First And Fourteenth Amendment Free Speech ,State Action, Conflict In Circuit On Preliminary Injunction.....20,23

IV D. The Suppression Of Medical Records, And Medical Expert Testimony.....23,24

V E. The Intent Of Congress Under Fair Housing for Personal Injury The Term "Injury" This Case Is The First Impression In This Circuit Needing Supervisory Opinion Of This Court It Impact Uninsured Victims Of Injury Of Relief Of Harm Caused By Conduct Under 42USC 3604.....,24,26

VI F. The Intent Of Congress For Legal Protection Under 42 -6000-1 Developmental Person And Family Members 42 USC10801 42 USC6010 ,42 USC 1988 USC 2000D..26,27

VII G. This Court Has So Far Departed From The Accepted Usual Course Of Judicial Proceeding For Federal Fair Housing Discrimination Litigation ,Laws And Procedures Besides Not Allowing Handicapped Proceeding Under A Civil Right Act Case . 27,30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: **[1]** **Page(s)**

Anast v Commonwealth Apartments

956 F Supp 792 (N.D ILL1997).....12

Andrew v Hotel Reed Nursing

167 F Supp 2d 1333(USDC Ala).....26

Applefield v Commercial Standard Ins Co

176 So 2d 366,377 (Fla 2d dca 1965).....11

Auto -Owners Insurance v Dewberry

383 So 2nd 1109 (Fla 1st DCA)1980.....28

Bangerter v Orem Utah

46 F3rd 1491 (10 th cir 1995).....16

Bani v Hud

102 F 31203,1207 (11th Cir 1997).....25

Bauer v State Of Florida

610 So 2d1326(Fla 2d DCA1992).....26

Belber v Lipson

905 S 2nd 549 USCA 1st ID p.62 Id p63.....23

Beyer v North Carolina Division Of Mental Health

2001 W.L 1319506W.D.N.C.....26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[2] Page(s)

Blum v Yaretsky

457 U.S 991 1 led).....14

Borrero v Metro Dade

19 F Supp2d 1318.....21

Broadmoor San Clemente Homeowner Association

30 Cal Rtpr2d 316 (cal 25 App4 Dist 62 ,1994).....17

Brock v Watergate Park

502 So 2d 1380 Fla 4th DCA 1.....23

Casa Marie Inc v Superior Court Of Puerto Rico D

752 F Suppl 1152 ID p.320.....18

Casa Marie v Superior

988 F2d 252 (1st Cir 1993).....18

C.F Indiana v Anderson

303 U 95 100 82 Led 685 ,58 SCR 443 (1938 Id p. 22.....20

Christianson v Colt Industries Operating Corp

486 U.S 800,814-818,108 Sct 2166,2177-2178 Led2d 811(1988).....27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[3] **Page(s)**

City Of Chicago v Matchmaker Real Estate

982 F 2d 1086 (7th Cir 1992).....29

City Of Emonds v Oxford House

514 U.S 725 ,732(1995)replaced by City of Athen
960F2d975(11th Cir).....7

Dan Glickman v Wileman Brother & Elliott

117 SCT 2130 ,138 Led (1997) Id p.7,8.....23

Don 's Porta Sign Inc v City Of Clearwater

829 F2d 1051,1054(11th cir 1987.....22

Dillard v Baldwin

53 F Supp 2d 1266.....21

EEOC v CEC Entertainment

ADA Case 10 No 1593.....25

Elrod v Burns

427 U.S 347,373 96 Sct 2673,,2690,49 Led2d 547 (1976).....23

Evan v Newton
382 U.S 296.....22

Franklin v Gwinnett Public Schools
503 U.S 60 (1992).....24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[4] Page(s)

Gebserv Largo Vista Indep School Dist

524 U.S 274,274,283-291,118 Sct 1989,1996-2000.....29

Gerber v Long Boat Harbour South

724 F Supp 884 22

Gittleman v Woodhaven

972 F Supp894.....17

Golden State Bottling Co v NLRB

414 U.S 168,182 n.5,38L Ed 2d 388 ,94 Sct 414(1973).....29

Goldberg v 400 East Ohio Condominium

12 F3d 820 (1998).....22

Gromes Resources Ltd v Parish Of Jefferson

234 F3d 192 200-02(5th Cir 2000).....8

Groner v Golden Gate Apartment

250 F 3d 1039 ,1047-WL557980(6th cir 5/25/2001).....16

Grubbs v Housing Authority of Joliet

1997 WL 281297 (N.D ILL).....29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[5] Page(s)

Forrester v White

484 U.S 210,108 Sct 538 98 Led 2nd 5559 (1998).....29

Harlow v Fitzgerald

457 U.S800,818,102 Sct 2727,2738,73 Led 2d 396 (1982)....29

Heckford v Florida Department Of Correction

699 So2d 247 (Fla 1st DCA 1997).....23

Hogar Agur Y Vida En El Desierto Inc v Suarez

36 F3d 177 (1th cir 1994).....7

Howard v City Of Beavercreek

18 F Supp 2d 866,872-3(S.D Ohio2000).....4

Houston v Southern Ry Co

37 F 3d 603 ,605 (11th 1994).....28

Justice v Pendleton Place Apartment

40 F3d 139 (6th cir 1994).....24

Jankowski Lee Associates v Hud

9 F3d 891 (7th cir 1996).....8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[4] Page(s)

Gebserv Largo Vista Indep School Dist

524 U.S 274,274,283-291,118 Sct 1989,1996-2000.....29

Gerber v Long Boat Harbour South

724 F Supp 884 22

Gittleman v Woodhaven

972 F Supp894.....17

Golden State Bottling Co v NLRB

414 U.S 168,182 n.5,38L Ed 2d 388 ,94 Sct 414(1973).....29

Goldberg v 400 East Ohio Condominium

12 F3d 820 (1998).....22

Gromes Resources Ltd v Parish Of Jefferson

234 F3d 192,200-02(5th Cir 2000).....8

Groner v Golden Gate Apartment

250 F 3d 1039 ,1047-WL557980(6th cir 5/25/2001).....16

Grubbs v Housing Authority of Joliet

1997 WL 281297 (N.D ILL).....29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[5] Page(s)

Forrester v White

484 U.S 210,108 Sct 538 98 Led 2nd 5559 (1998).....29

Harlow v Fitzgerald

457 U.S800,818,102 Sct 2727,2738,73 Led 2d 396 (1982)....29

Heckford v Florida Department Of Correction

699 So2d 247 (Fla 1st DCA 1997).....23

Hogar Agur Y Vida En El Desierto Inc v Suarez

36 F3d 177 (1th cir 1994).....7

Howard v City Of Beavercreek

18 F Supp 2d 866,872-3(S.D Ohio2000).....4

Houston v Southern Ry Co

37 F 3d 603 ,605 (11th 1994).....28

Justice v Pendleton Place Apartment

40 F3d 139 (6th cir 1994).....24

Jankowski Lee Associates v Hud

9 F3d 891 (7th cir 1996).....8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[6] **Page(s)**

Judy B v Borough

889 F Supp 792 (M.D Pa 1995).....15

Kelly v State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins

727 So 2d 1145 (Fla 5th DCA 1998).....23

Latera V The Isle At Mission Bay Homeowners

655 So 2d 144 (Fla 4th DCA 1995).....22

Liddy v Cisneros

823 F Supp 164 (S.D Ny 1993).....16

Love v Garcia

634 So 2nd 158(Fla 1994).....23

Maerck v Birchansky

549 So 2d 199 (Fla 3rd DCA 1989 23,28

Malladi v Brown

987 Supp 893(MD Ala 1997).....27,28

Marathon v Maple Grove Condominium Assoc

101 F Supp 2d 1041 (N.D ILL2001).....16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[7] **Page(s)**

Massaro v Main lands Section 1&2 Civic Assoc

3F3d 1472 (11th Cir 1993.....23

Mayer v Ridley

465 F2d 630 Id 637,639,640.....21

Mc Kinnon v Nashville Banner Pub Co

513 U.S 352,360,115 Sct 879 ,885 ,130 Led 2d 82(1995).....30

Monell v Dept Of Social Services

436 U.S 658 98 Sct 2018 (1978).....9

National Car Rental System v Bostic

423 So 2nd 915 (Fla 3d DCA 1982).....28

Oladeinde v City Of Birmingham

230 F3d 1275,1288 (11th cir 2000).....27

Olmstead v Lc

527 U.S 581 (1999 11 th cir No 97-8538 04/08/1998

Supreme No 98-536 (4/08/1999) Presidential Order Bush

No 13217 6/18/2002 Fed Register Vol .66 No.120.....7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[8] Page(s)

Oxford House v City Of Virginia Beach

825 F Supp1251(Ed Va 1993).....7

Oxford House v Town Of Babylon

819 F Supp1179 (Ed Ny 1993).....7

Parker v De Puerto Rico

ADA Case 10 No 1557 (225 Fed 3d 1st App Ny 2000.....25

Parks v Williams

556 F2d 132 Fla 4th DCA1.....21

Pierce V Smith

301 So 2d 805 (Fla 2d DCA 1974.....28

Pitts v Pine Valley

695 F Supp 778 (DNJ1988).....16

Pulcinella v Ridley Tp

822 F Supp 204(Ed Pa 1993).....18

Quail Creek Property Owners v Hunter

538 So 2d 1288 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[9] Page(s)

Ranger Ins Co v Bal Harbor

548 So 2d 1005 Fla 1989 13

Reeves v Plumbing Co

120 Sct 2097,2108 30

Robinson V City of Friendswood

890 F Supp 616 (Sd Tx 1995).....16

Rojas v TK Communication

87 F3d745 *1996 5th Cir Lexis 17428 Id,Pg 4* 15-17Id p5..29

Scatou v Clifford

1972)24 Cal App3d 46,52,100 Cal Rtpr 779.....17

San Pedro Hotel Co Inc v City Of Los Angeles

159 F 3d 470,475 (9th cir 1998).....5

Sattfield v Wal Mart

135 F3d 973 (1998 U.S App 5th Cir Lexis 2960 P. 6**23 29

Shelly v Kraemer

334 U.S 1 -19-20 68 Sct 836-845(1948).....22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[10]

Page(s)

Skislak v Wilson

422 So 2d 776 (Fla 3d DCA 1985).....28

Sofarelli v Pinellas County

931 F2nd 718,723 (11th Cir 1991).....22

Sun Supermarket Inc v Fields

568 So 2d 480 (Fla 3d DCA1990).....28

Sutton Enterprise v Santa Clara Const

767 So 2d547(Fla,2d 2000).....11

Torrey V Leesburg Regional Medical Center

769 So 2nd 1040 Fla 2000.....26

Tulsa Professional Collection Service v Pope

485 U.S 478 ,486,99 Led 2nd 565 108 Sct 1340 (1988).....21

Trafficante v Metroplitian Life

409 USC205 93 Sct 364 ,34 Led 2d 415 (1972).....25

Trovato Durost v City Of Manchester

992 F Supp493 1997 U.S Lexis 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

[11] **Page(s)**

Upholsterers International Union Pension Funds

v Artistic Furniture Of Pontiac

7th Appeal cir No 89-3058(920 F 2d 1323,1990 U.S App

Lexis 21428.....29

U.S Of America v Popa

187 F3d 672,1999 U. S App Lexis 2242.....13

U.S v City Of Philadelphia

838 Fed Supp 223 (1993.....16

U.S Of America v Jack freer

864 F Supp 324.....25

U.S v American Key Bank National Assoc Lexis 199 U.S

Dist Lexis 14651.....29

U.S v Sea Wind Of Marco

893 F Supp 1051.....29

West Virginia V Barnette

319 U.S 624 Sct 1942.....11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES——Continued

[12] **Page(s)**

White Egret Condominium

379 So 2d 346 Fla 1979.....22

Worth v Tyler II U.S Title & Abstract Grundy County Title

2001 U.S App 7th Cir Lexis 27212 Id pg 5* 17-18.....29

Wyatt v Cole

504 Us 158 112 Sct 1827,118 Led.....29

Young v Warner Jenkin

ADA Case 8 Case No.887 U.S Appeal No 98-125
(8/24/1988.....4,25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES———Continued

[13] Page(s)

Statutes:

42 U.S.C 10801.....8,26
42U.SC 12202.....13
42 U.S.C &1231-1289.....7
42 U.S.C& 1981 et.seq.,1983.....3,5,19
42U.S.C&1986.....12
42 U.S.C &1988.....19,26
42 U.S.C &2000D.....7,19,26
42 U.S.C &2651,2653.....13
FLA Statue 28.222,.....13,17
FLA Statue 177.01.....17
45 U.S.C& 3601 3602,3604et.seq.....3,5,8,12,16
FLA.Statue Chapter 90-179&1.....7
FLA.Statue617.307.,617.303(1).....9,18,19
FLA Staue 689.18(7).....13,17
FLA Statue 718.113(4).....17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES -Continued

[14] Page(s)

FLA Statue 720301-312,720.3075.....17
FLA. Statue .&& 760.20-760.37 ,760.23(8)(9).....3,5,16
42 U.S.C&6000-01.....5,26
42 U.S.C &&6010.....7,26

Miscellaneous:

Presidential order No.13217 Fed Req. Vol. 66 JUNE 18,2001.....3,7

Steven Siegel "Article The Constitution And Private Government: Toward Recognition Of Constitution In Private Communities Fifty Years Marsh v Alabama 6"Wm & Bill, Mary (1988) RTS J 461.....18

U.S.C Fla. 1ST Amend-Deed Reorder 2000 United States Code Book.....21

Treatise On Constitution Law Volume 4 SECTION 19.1 to20.61 Roland Rotunda /Novak Id.P.433-435 20.31 Federal Discrimination Law ,Litigation, Procedures ,Robert G Schweeman.....28

American Civil Liberties Union Handbook "Right Of People With Mental Disabilities.....15,20

Disability Rights Guide 2nd Edition Charles D Goldman Esq Washington,Dc.....15,20

PETTITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The petitioner respectfully petitions' for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the eleventh circuit court of appeal and lower court.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Eleventh Circuit Court Appeals Court's opinion on non argument calendar entry order (App., infra 99-118a)is reported at No 02-1109 October 17,2002 affirmed unpublished, The Federal Middle District of Tampa Florida Courts filed October, 19,1999 reported at Case No.9902413-CIV-T-30(App., infra 1-45a) unreported Preliminary Injunction filed December 1999 Two Preliminary Injunction Order final April 11,2000 (App.,45-54a) ,Summary Judgment (App.,55-75a) Summary Judgment Order(App., 76-88a) First of three Order Denying Plaintiffs' Reconsideration Order (App., infra 89-92a) Summary Judgment Order On Personal Injury (App., 93-96a)

JURISDICTION

This judgment of this court was enter on October 17,2002 and timely petition for rehearing option en banc sporte given and asking for a stay granted November 12,2002 until January 31,2003 Petitioner filed Writ of Certiorari December 26,2002 given under Rule 14.5 until February 26,2003 This Courts' jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U. S .C &1254(1)(2)Rule 44.1 Townes Assoc Ltd v City Of Greenville 226 S ct 81,86,221 SE 2nd 773,775(1996)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution provides in relevant part:[T]he Laws of the United States***shall be the supreme Law Of the Land *****any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary not withstand" U. S Const art.VI,Cl.2. XIV sec 1,2 IV sec

The Fourteen Amendment provides that no state '.....shall.....deprive any person of life ,liberty or property without due process of law...."

1983[Each person]corporations under the color of law of any State subject citizen to deprivation of right shall be liable to that person.

1982 All citizens of the United States shall the***[same rights,] ** in every State and Territory as is enjoy purchase lease sell hold convey real and personal property . Florida Constitution section 2 Inalienable Rights among which are the right to enjoy and***** [defend***]life and liberty to pursue happiness and to acquire ,possess and ****[protect****property .

No person shall be deprived of any right because of race ,religion ,nation origin, or [**physical disability].** Free Speech U. S Florida Constitution Bill Of Rights U. S Constitution article I, section 10 Florida Constitution sections 1," Political power all political power is inherent in the people. "The enunciation herein of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by the people",

Section Fla Const. Freedom of speech No law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech as stated in article 1 of U. S constitution.

The people shall have the contractual 1981 Equal Protection contractual right "the rights protected by this section are protected against impairment [harm, injury] by[non governmental discrimination] and impairment under the color of law, enforcement without due process, the petitioners' right to form or assembly ,Fla Const. section 5.1981) 1981 versus 1982"1983 impairment infringement of private property rights , enacting laws that are reserved to government only, enforcement without seeking due process. The statutory violation as stated within petition of writ of certiorari as follows:

STATEMENT

The petitioner are facing mandate against them instead of the federal courts protection for handicap and a blind severe developmental person and companion dog for the blind and support dog for a person with mental disabilities . **Federal ruling against Presidential Order Bush 13217 Fed registers Vol 66 No 120 June 18,2001 the first case since Olmstead v Lc We refer this court to docket No . 02-8569 dated January 22,2003 the writ of certiorari of Bettie J Newbold and appendix with all legal orders provided for your understanding of the case .The petitioner will cite the page number of this appendix.**

October 1999 all petitioners' filed a [joint] class action federal complaint (App., infra 1-27a) stating this is a civil rights case referring to human right ,handicap rights, private property right 1983 et. al seq and the first and fourteen amendment under free speech and fair housing discrimination action under 45 U.S.C&&3601 et seq and Fla. Stat.&& 760.20-760.37, 760.23 (8) (9) (App., infra 15a) defined in detail in federal complaint

Defendants claim deed restriction bar a handicap family installing a small section fence with bushes concealing the fence on the front of [private property] for a companion dog for the blind and support dog for a person with mental disabilities and a handicap wheel chair ramp and small deck at the main entrance double doors next to the front garage and walkway. Defendants claim they are unable to change deed restriction because of their concern it will alteration the nature of the community and imposition of undue burden or hardship on the community as stated in their summary judgment

(App., infra Id p. 61(7),62 (1),64(5) 70(VII)

The contemporaneous written record of Sasser repeated denial of petitioners ' request underscores the absence of any legitimate justification for his action or forcing the handicap resident to struggle on without them or ,gave no consideration to the risk of harm or about the impact to petitioners if they were denied.

The deed restriction which are broad, change on whim and overreaching and a well known fact developer deed are not enforceable that only mineral ,air, water ,land rights are by law and other issue are reserved to the courts or county and legislature opinions ,enforcement without due process

(App., infra Id p. 30a section 1) said nothing about rear placement or handicap accommodation, nor contain any rules, just that denial of approval may be based on any ground ,including purely aesthetic grounds and their sole discretion under the back drop of other homeowners that have front road side deck style front porches in the same location and a home in the community has a three story homes with deck on all floor rear ,side and front of property. **Howard v City of Beavercreek 18 F Supp.2d866,872-73 (S .D Ohio2000)(App.,infra 86,88a)**

Defendants states all tort defense reasons, concerns for property values and aesthetics, detraction ,intersection problem, community rules, nuisance to the community with no noxious or offensive activity and they have to uphold the integrity of the community, according to this case aesthetics and property values aren't viable reasons. Petitioner given a chose of human rights or property values .Palm Beach Florida has real estate sign and fences has not lowered their property values. **Young vs Warner 8 ADA Case No 887inconsistent reason** Petitioner Loren overall caretaker has been a person residing in home with two handicapped family member seeking accommodation covered under fair housing and Florida Health Surrogate

with Special Power Of Attorney 45 U. S. C &&3602 (d),3604 and Fla .Stat 760.22(8)760.23 San Pedro Hotel Co Inc v City of Los Angeles 159 F 3rd 470,475(9th cir 1998) Loren has Standing (App., infra Id.p.86a)

Loren seeking handicap accommodation for a blind and severely developmental disabled due to retardation quiet and gentle in nature removed from institutional care her aunt petitioner Charlene Janke in case and petitioner mother Bettie J Newbold declare disabled by Social Security then transfer to social security retirement and current age 79 with two artificial knees with limited walking ability suffer severe osteoarthritis and other medical conditions .Bettie J Newbold last artificial knee done four week before leaving for Florida no more pain in legs but limited walking ability looking forward to retirement in the Florida home sponsor by her step son residing with her daughter Loren.

Bettie J Newbold step sister and appointed by Social Security legal representative payee to Charlene Janke ADA term federal recipient[an individual or entity receiving federal funds] through father and mother benefits agree to care for her step sister after death of her father and mother rather than returning her to institutional care again as what is known as community residential home base program with family members a waiver program under Social Security Developmental Person 42 U.SC 6000-01 and Micassa Senate Bill S1293,Benefits are transfer according to placements .

There are two separate program under social security act one residing with family member and the other unrelated member forming a family as in Olmstead v LC .According to ADA both programs and disabled under the same class have the same legal protection under the law and that access to a building mean the main entrance as other handicap family in communities across the United States. Back door entrances were rejected decades

ago. Defendants summary judgment(App.,infra 68,70a)A front yard ramp and deck was not a reasonable modification that was necessary to allow Charlene full enjoyment of the premises or necessary to afford her equal opportunity to use and enjoy the dwelling "and not necessary for Newbold caretaker having the same needs as the ward if it was not reasonable it wouldn't have been approved

Defendants Summary Judgment (App., infra 55-75) dated January 31,2000 has many incorrect statement Charlene Janke developed breast cancer after six month arriving into this Florida rural deed restricted community given a wheelchair to transport her to the cancer treatment center because of her blindness and fear of strange places however still able to be guided by caretaker down stairs

Newbold and Janke learned to maneuver stairs once arriving in the new Florida home as in Chicago both had no problems beforehand, During recovery time for health reason ask the community for a fence planning entire front handicap accommodation project delayed by cancer .

Caretaker notice a [slight] refusal to go down stairs from Janke her understanding she was always going to the doctor. If the small section of front fence was given at the time she would have gone outside everyday with her dog as in Illinois and would have forgotten about the fear of the doctors visits that Janke related to the stairs . Janke would not remain out side without her dog along side .The front was the best location without causing [ADA Term undue hardship]major construction cost inside and outside to place the handicap accommodation in the rear or wrap a deck around the home where it was not needed besides no exist to the street and being the garage and sidewalk in front and main entrance double doors and front open main room floor plan .**We went forward with request asking for front entrance door**

handicap accommodation for safety home modification on home base program caretaker have sole judgment.

Developmental Disabled Bill Of Rights 42 U.S.C 6010 covered under the Ada Act II ,III42 USC 1231-1289 infra Olmstead v Lc 527 U.S 581(1999)11th cir Appeal No 97-8538 04/08/1998 Supreme No 98-536 4/21/99Presidential Order Bush 13217 6/18/2002 Fed Register Vol.66 No.120Oxford House City of Virginia Beach 825 F.Supp 1251 (Ed Va 1993)(App.,infra 69a)Oxford House vs Town of Babylon 819F Supp 1179(Ed Ny1993) (App.,infra 66a 70a)(City of Edmonds vs Oxford House 514 U.S 725,732,(1995) replaced by City of Athen 960 F 2d975(11th Cir)Hogar AguaY Vida En El DesiertoInc vSuarez 36 F 3d177 (1th Cir 1994)Massaro v Mainlands Section 1&2 Civic Assoc 3 F3rd 1472 (11th Cir1993)(App.,infra 84a)

After Loren requests to Sasser , and between denials of their front entrance door handicap accommodation and request to employee of Developers' Firm Hernando Beach Inc a public entity profit corporation created 1964 dealing in interstate real estate transaction commerce USC2000 without handicap accommodation for model for handicap interstate buyers and dealing with Florida non profit corporation act "Ch.90-179&1,issues of association deed restriction .

The officers and employee Aiken of Hernando Bch Inc reply to handicap request were "Rules are Rules ,You knew the Rules before you moved into the community this is a deed restricted community, Informed of Handicap stated "We don't care who lives in your home rules are rules. "Commission On Human Relation State Of Florida phone records confirm same employee and their rules taken from of Hernando Bch Inc under 3604 statements

After Loren conversion with the county commissioner aware of developer dictator style by complaints by other homeowners brought to the county.

Commissioner claiming private community petitioners must seek private legal action. This is a safety issue of a resident of the county and fair housing a bonafide government interest. Commissioner aware of total ban on any signs and attends association meeting.

The entire matter was turned over to the Attorney General Office Oct 1998 after verbal request and written request to Sasser from July until October and after our fears were realized when Janke and Newbold fell permanently injuring themselves while attempting to negotiate their stairs.

Petitioners filed a HUD complaint listing all parties respondents after a year of form letters and respondents claiming private community no duty to fair housing ,community rules ,unable to change deed restriction, remain idle and the commission asking the community to consider accommodation and avoidance of personal injury Florida attorney filed federal complaint and administrative case closed. Gromes Resources Ltd v Parish Of Jefferson 234F3d 192,200-02 (5th Cir 2000) Jankowski Lee Association v HUD 9 F3d 891(7th Cir 1996) A outright refusal or extend long delay or inconsistent reasons establish violation of 3604.

Attorney General felt July to October was enough time and blueprint would be returned denied due to the tone of the letter stating "so we can tell which deed restriction will be violated" and said they would file a criminal case but needed letter from commission

Petitioner Janke and Newbold request to agencies for legal protection under 42 U.S.C 10801 and other federal statue were futile .Request came during a time when the developer and Sasser spearheaded an effort to dissolve the former association. Sasser called a meeting May 06,1998 to dissolve the old association **speaking with old association director and old association attorney he**

stated the Charles M Sasser Jr had no right to dissolve the association, write letters, deny handicap accommodation ,legal case pending.

After reading the minutes of the meeting to dissolve association and Charles M Sasser disposition there is no question his personal action broke the corporation president veil of protection and direct and personal harm of constitutional harm and personal injury .

Sasser has a direct ,real and personal "causal Connection far beyond would clearly not run afoul of **(Monell v Dept of Social Services 436 US 658 98 Sct 2018 (1978) and its progeny which prohibit 1983 liability based on respondeat superior or without causal connection between defendants and injury to plaintiff** This profit corporation being father and son both being real estate attorney active and non active held at a higher standard has written all association legal documents current and past has taken homeowner to court

Even a resident manual written and name as association and Hernando Bch Inc officer Shirley Aiken ,David Sasser Attorney At Law prepared for Charles M Sasser Jr Attorney At Law for association created 1982 that speak of safety and protection ,conflict of interest, duties of agents ,will comply to state , local federal laws given to petitioners .Association was largely inactive but by developer rule until 1988 after this association became active it excise police power and interpret deed restriction however the developer control in the community contemplated by Fla Stat &617.307 evidently never occurred.

Given the developer strong personally view, if he doesn't agree with the issue or policies or action of association board member and refusal to change deed restriction that would create a breach of peace Petitioner

when we first arrived in the community experience the conflict with the developer and association [approved] by association without written request on site, for a dog run then developer called association half way through project; then denied asking for drainage plans not required by county ,permit already issued ; we had to go around and take down other homeowner's addresses ;other homeowner request for patio no drainage plan; no further words or approval given by association or developer.

Sasser confirm in disposition aware of fair housing laws and aware of handicap Janke on the dispute of dog run [Newbold limited walking]according to statue that trigger the duty to the fair housing statue.

The developers given the lot owned by developer and demonstrated ability to secure developers' 18 years Developer/owner financed by insured federal bank gain lot owners approval through debt and able to use out of state lot owners proxy vote against a hundred homeowners in a 425 unit residential development .The developer can likely assure that future votes on modification or amendment went the way desired.

In the developer speech at meeting to dissolve the association "I have no intention whatsoever of relaxing those restriction ,neither do I have any intention of completely conveying the right to enforce those restriction to anyone .But I will ask probably three members of this community to help me enforce and help me police the restriction and see that they are enforced and we will enforce them anyway that we have to ,including certainly court action if that should becomes necessary.....

Homeowners went to the model of Hernando Bch Inc since Charles M Sasser seldom remained at the office. 'The restrictions are completely in my providence and my corner only or in Hernando Beach which I am Hernando

Beach', in a reflection of his development of the entire beach area. Asked by homeowner will they be kept informed Sasser replied "I certainly am .I have no choice but to operate that way . West Virginia v Barnette319 U .S 624 S ct 1942 "the fundamental rights may not be submitted to a vote.

Developer filed lawsuit against the former association for injunctive relief protesting the conduct March 1998 meeting to elect new board member seeking to freeze assets claiming mismanagement of funds by association state investigation found no merit to allegation. Fla. Stat 617.303(1), 617.307

During the interim period between the vote to dissolve the former association May 06,1998 and the formation of HBSPOA in April 1999 the homeowner voted to have Charles M Sasser Jr to have authority to operation a somewhat non active association and enforcement of deed restriction

HUD complaint filed for discrimination upon contact by the State Of Florida developer an expedient was instrumental in forming a steering Committee suddenly for no reason in a expedite matter with old association lawsuit pending One of the steering committee member real estate agent working at the model across the street from petitioners' home signed for petitioner letter became officer of new association.

Fla .Stat 617.303 (1)the fiduciary relationship between [new] association [perpetual for duration] board member and petitioner failed to engender so much as an inquiry or expression of sympathy let alone any offer of help not even during hurricanes **.A person or business has no right to shut his eyes or ears to information` Sutton Enterprises v. Santa Clara Const 767 So 2d 547 (Fla 2nd 2000)citing Applefield v .Commercial Standard Ins Co 176 So 2d366,377 (Fl a 2nd d c a 1965)**

New Association basically the same people surely

aware before, by new legal non profit corporation[by - laws]created before new association formed under indemnification for agents refer to human rights for the first time. Even Loren certified letters months before federal complaint filed 42 USC 1986 action for neglect to prevent and 3604 trigger duty to statue association reply letter chose to avoid all issues in the case take no action but to say they could not change deed restriction or create handicap policies a HUD requirement and supported Sasser through the entire litigation used boiler plate answers on motions to compel. In discovery wouldn't state developer action were wrong claiming private community no duty to fair housing act before a federal complaint was filed . Feeling force to move due to discriminatory attitude ,neutral rule disparate impact ,and needed accommodation

Association president Doyle a real estate agent claim no duty to fair housing ,could not say in court if they would approve handicap accommodation must go in front of community board members .HBSPOA'S current position in defense of Sassers' action shows it true colors and confirm request would have been futile . Both the developer with his conduct ,inaction and the association inaction claim no fiduciary duty or liability.

Anast v. Commonwealth Apartments 956 F Suppl 792 (N.D ILL1997) Under the Supremacy clause the law sometimes mandates changing rules that generally apply to everyone so as to make the burden less onerous on the handicap.

.Sadly those denial caused a steep price they caused a family to suffer negligent infliction of emotional distress of close family relationship of the injured persons ,stress on the family unity, loss of privacy and family rights anger ,embarrassment and mental anguish ,pain and suffer of **SEVERE PERMANENT PERSONAL INJURY**

Lower court informed of matter under 42 U.S.C & 2653, 2651Recovery by United State **for past, future medical ,hospital ,**in home therapy and nursing, bills by third party liability for two handicap one being blind and developmental person which is a outrageous **there is no community rule or law that should warrant this action.** Respondents cite Ranger Ins Co v Bal Harbour 548 So 2d 1005 (Fla 1989)Relocation the moving doesn't come easy and adjustment for a blind and developmental person and drove a family from their home July 2000

Petitioner faced judicial enforcement leaving this Florida deed restricted community due to the denial of accommodation and discriminatory attitude the reason needing the real estate sign, the end of a civil right case Fla Stat 718.113(4) and Fla.Stat 689.18 of a deed restriction created 1982 under Fla Stat 28.222 [banning all signs] if they put a " by owner "for 'sale sign" on private property in front of home or window inside dwelling which is unconstitutional and private property

.Petitions filed for injunction Dec.1999 seeking to post sign granted and denied by false legal motion blocking injunction. Then came community retaliation attacking our real estate office and letter to petitioners' U. S Of America v Popa 187 F 3d 672,1999 U.S App Lexis 2242

Other Homeowners taken to court and threat letters in legal file claiming protection ,rights under the Florida Homeowner Chapter in the legal file .Interrogatories stated they never approved any signs42 U.SC 12202 Prohibition against retaliation after posting of sign under civil protest Conspiracy to interfere with civil right, made false statement to the Chief Justice that they approval signs as deed restriction states and aware it was a total ban on any signs was in effect and placed on homeowners on private property lower court informed couldn't impeach witness's. Aware that they have no ownership of right away in deed restriction refer to as county easement

and public street in the non gated community receiving all county services, circulating petitions' to the county for federal funds on projects

They haven't found a sign they like for twenty years for a homeowner except for developer sign on lots he owns or in route models sold as soon as completed ,banks ,service and construction companies signs removed during litigation. The petitioner feel they had the same rights as any resident in Hernando County under the constitution fourteenth amendment ,1982,1983Developer models sold as soon as completed this is unfair trade and a monopoly.

Under the Florida Homeowner Chapter, lots used for commercial usage and lots used for the purpose of construction for resale are not covered under statue. Fla.617.307

Petitioner under a Hernando County Ordnance that limit political graffiti sign during all federal and state election residents may post a 2x1 foot then 45 days unlimited signage Perhaps petitioners doesn't feel the election free speech during that period of time. Florida Constitutional all political power is inherent in the people The enunciation herein of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by the people.

This only gives encouragement for deed restricted community both relate time place size the last legal hoop hole ,identical restriction design to restrict speech not allow flow of the speech Quail Creek Property Owners v Hunter 538 So2d 1288,Blum v. Yaretsky(457 U.S 991, 1 led) Encouragement either overt or covert the choice must be in law be deemed to be that of the State "

I (A) REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION THE LOWER COURT ERRED

A. Under the Federal and Florida Fair Housing Act deed restriction or construction and applications of deed

restrictions that conflict with the obligation to permit handicap persons "full enjoyment " or equal use" of their homes are invalid or enforceable .**Judy B v Borough 889 F Supp 792 (M.D Pa 1995)Rehabilitation Act of 1988 act Housing for handicap is entitled to a favored status because it must be reasonably accommodation in a way housing for non handicapped person need not be.....**

The lower court has erred on Summary Judgment Order (App., infra 76-88a) and Plaintiff Motion For Reconsideration Order(App. ,infra 89-92a) The court was given the Hernando County local fence code word for word and a copy that the community has always overruled, overridden local laws that a **[permit was issued** There was never an intersection problem under the **fence count for[a blind person companion dog]and support dog for a person with mental disabilities** the reason based on there is no evidence that other able bodied homeowner that are not handicap were allowed a fence in front. Perhaps it would stand to reason since this is the first handicap family in the community. A misconception of reasonable that applies to the medical problem and how the accommodation relates to the disabled person and not to the able bodied person

The court states in Plaintiff Motion to Reconsideration (App.,91a) the court does not mean to imply that defendants suggestion is reasonable per se .The court states petitioner has not proven discrimination intent which is not required under federal fair housing discrimination laws litigation and procedures law book .

The logic of fencing a companion and support dog for a blind developmental person in the rear or side has no merit instead of along side the disabled person.

The court cited apartment cases and condominium case which we are not under that Florida Condominium Statue ,this is not a handicap accommodation on the common area of joint ownership to balance the interest but

petitioners private property ,Marathon v Maple Grove Condominium Assoc 101 F Supp 2d 1041 (N.D ILL2001)(App.,infra 85a)**petitioners are the housing provider** in Liddy v Cisneros 823 F Supp164 S.D.Ny 1993)(App.,infra 66,71a) **what could the jury tell us in** Robinson vs City of Friendswood 890 FSuppl616 (S.D TX1995) (App.,infra 68,73,85a)Groner v Golden Gate Apartments 250 F3d 1039,1047 -WL557980 (6thcir 5/25/2001)

(App.,infra 86,91a) The community acted as a landlord however disabled families purchase a homes to not have a landlord for easy home modification.

Evidence is clear that Hernando County changed a zoning law to accommodate a blind child for the entire property to be fenced full enjoyment U .S v City of Philadelphia 838 Fed Supp223(1993)City zoning law violated 3604 by not allowing a side yard dwelling located in rear of property

In our case rear, doorway ,stair narrow and steep. Trovato Durost v City of Manchester 992 F Supp493 1997 U.S Dist Lexis Needed front paved parking space

Pitts v Pine Valley 695 F Suppl778 (DNJ1988) the rule was analogized to be a zoning ordinance. In order to find state action the court need not identify a statutory provision where a custom having the force of law is in evidence" Communities were not vested under the Constitution to create ordinance or laws, state action was needed to correct this unlawful practice

Under 3604 ,3602 (h) Fla &&760 .22(7) 760.23 for Petitioners Newbold and Janke discrimination on the grounds and under the meaning one who alleges discrimination must show that she handicap protected class group received different treatment vis a vis member of a different **class group of able bodied person .Bangerter v Orem Utah 46 F3rd1491 (10th Cir1995) "a plaintiff can make out a case of intentional**

discrimination under fair housing merely by showing that a protected group handicap has been subject to explicitly differential discriminatory treatment Handicap needing accommodation become equal to able bodied person after they are accommodated.

When a deed restricted community under[Florida Homeowner Chapter Fla Stat 720 . 301- 312, 720.3075, 720.34] states they can not accommodate a handicap because of their duty to 424 other able bodied homeowners and no duty to the handicap and because they can't change their deed restriction due to community rules(App.,61a (7),64 a(5)) **Gittleman v Woodhaven 972 F Supp 894 failure to change master deed violated fair housing statue creates the discriminatory act.** covered under [Florida deed recorder Fla. Stat & 28. 222] [42 U .S Code Book 1St Amendment deed recorder 2000] [. Platting Statue & & 177.01 , The county imposed no condition for approval of Developer's plat application remove these unconstitutional issues may enter on private property without due process or county code enforcement approval section one of deed restriction ,requirement of written rules ,no sole discretion , denial on any grounds and we will approve plat.

.(App., infa 142a) Florida .Stat.& 689.18(7)] [Enforcement Stat. 718.113(4)]The community states a request for an accommodation or modification is reasonable only if it does not require a fundamental alteration in nature of deed restrictions or undermine its purpose in defendants summary judgments that is discrimination.(App., infra 62a(1))

II (B) CHALLENGE Under 42 USC &1983

Broadmoor San Clemente Homeowners Association cited 30Cal Rptr 2d 316(cal 25App4 Dist,62, 1994)Scatou v Clifford (1972)24Cal .App3d ,46,52 ,100 Cal Rptr779 These cases covers fair housing *(To discriminate unlawful through public or private land use practices is**

not limit restrictive covenants and constitutional issue and didn't need transcripts to research the intent of congress (App. ,infra 115-116a)even when petitioners gave a statement of proceeding in affidavit form and citing Casa Marie Inc v Superior Court of Puerto Rico (D .Puerto Rico 752 F Supp.1152 Id, p.320(App.,infra 72a)Respondents speak of 988 F 2d252 (1st cir 1993)Casa Marie v Superior Court bonafide government interest civil rights , fair housing handicapped rights Respondents case Pulcinella v Ridley Tp 822 F Supp 204 (Ed Pa 1993) Respondents case opinion vacated(App.,infra 73a)

The petitioner ask where their private property right are and they need to be returned to their rightful owner this intentional tort placed on our property or as stated substantially interferes with the other owner's use and a person enjoyment of land .Conversion is the third type of intentional tort direct against property it is an unauthorized assumption and exercise of the right of ownership over goods or personal chattel that belong to another ,to the alteration of their right .It is a serious interference with a owners right of possession without consent or legal privilege deed restriction only speak of joint ownership of one percent that the seller gives the buyer of common area only

Petitioner challenge the infringement of their private property rights if one thing is clear about the constitution our founder fathers were strong on land rights and a one system of government .Steven Siegel "Article The Constitution And Private Government :Toward The Recognition of Constitution In Private Communities Fifty Years After Marsh v Alabama "6"WM &Bill Rts J .461 (1998)Florida legislature Fla 689.18 (7) created for the benefit of homeowner rights but what has happen contractual right have been support by the courts

elevating of one constitutional right that a contract can not violate another constitutional right private property rights

The legislature has superimpose contractual rights which is superficial to the principal subject of the contract property rights .Homeowner Chapter has given the right to form title to the common area and allows rules to be written for common area and to protect homeowners There are local county code enforcement and laws that covers aesthetic ,safety and any other issue

There are constitutional limitation of the power of the legislature under United States Article 1 section 10 restrictive covenant at issue herein may raise constitutional issues no law shall be passed restrain or abridge ,or infringement of private property rights 42 USC 1983 et.al seq][1988,2000d] [Fla Stat 617.303(1) Condominium Chapter] or apartments or public housing cases legal cases do not apply under Homeowner statue . The court will search in vain to locate a case of single family home with private property rights that the subject is handicap accommodation

.What government agency has given the right for a community group without medical or architectural expertise to make sole judgment on handicap accommodation and the needs of a blind developmental person on our private property. What government agency has passed a law or given a community group the right to say where handicap can be on private property not civil rights or contract laws

.A agreement totally restraining the exercise of a man or one restraining him in any particular place is void ;a agreement is void if it violates the constitution from the state it was written this deed restriction of sole discretion and no rules allows for unconstitutional acts Segregation cases all person shall be entitled to be free at any establishment , place, dwelling or premise.

Handicap in communities across the nation have front main entrance door handicap accommodation if one enter or seat briefly is a exercise of free movement .

Perhaps a case of a community challenge for a single family group home in residential area dispute over zoning laws commercial or residential or family status however they as well have private property rights. HUD is over all housing issues and their paid state agent fair housing in each state. Disability statue must be the standard of ADA

In reviewing the condominium cases all dispute of handicap accommodation are on the common area which is subject to joint ownership in this case handicap accommodation are on private property petitioner are the housing provider holding title to the property. There is no monitor system establish for deed recorder or Florida Homeowner Chapter before the high cost of litigation County doesn't require a permit for handicap ramps

. Legislature can't infringe or take private property rights under the constitution allowing a board to make rules, liens on property they don't have ownership or have legal title there should be separate deed recording for the common area which would increase income for the county and protect the right to form .The homeowner seller must give buyer clear title to the one percent title to common area deed and avoid all these litigation in the court system

Cf Indiana v Anderson 303 U.95 100 82 Led 685 ,58 SCR 443[1938]pg22 But clearly when the state make a classification as to what contract are permissible that classification is state action .Judicial cases that prove to be prohibit under the Florida Homeowners Chapter the subject is recorder under the statue.

III(C) CHALLENGE UNDER FIRST ,FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ,STATE ACTION, CONFLICT OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS IN THE CIRCUIT

THAT OPERATES IN FUTURO (App.,infra 45-54a) Treatise On Constitutional Law Volume 4 Section 19.1 to 20.61 Roland Rotunda/nowak pg 433-435 20.31

Florida USC 1st Amendment2000 Deed recorder ," The party seeking to uphold a restriction or even partial on commercial speech carries the burden of justifying it and this burden is not satisfied by mere speculation or conjecture a showing of existence of harm [safety]it doesn't relieve the state of it burden .**Mayer v Ridley 465 F 2d 630 pg 639** Rubber stamp deed restriction with out review surely too great a price to pay for vindication of constitutional rights, recorder are not insulted from judicial review pg 637,640 recording documents is likely to give them legitimacy and effectiveness in the eyes of laymen which they do not have by law. **Dillard vs Baldwin 53 F Supp 2nd 1266 ,Borrero v Metro Dade 19 F Supp 2d 1318 Both State actors** Deed Restricted Communities on the other coast of Florida according to relocation real estate agents allow signs because of supreme court caseThe community voted during litigation install a bulletin board next to boat ramp claiming as a way for a homeowners to sell their home that cars drive by and never notice and now allows a small sign in front of homeowner private property stating "cleaning boat " never contract deed recorder or changed deed restriction

.There has to be a reason government interest based on safety must be proven to a deed recorder A single family homeowner in a rural area can not post a small residential for sale sign a first amendment right on private property this would not pass a mean test which is seldom used on free speech and is a government function

Tulsa Professional Collection Service v Pope 485 U.S 478 ,486,99 led 2nd 565 108 Sct1340[1988]state action when community is performing duty of state involvement. Parks v Williams 556 F 2d 132 Fla 4th DCA1 case speak in great detail of state action" All

community that open their community to the public they are bonds to the same state and federal laws. The essential principal and brute remain of March,logan Valley Evan v Newton 382 US296 Shelly vKraemer 334 US1-19-20 ,68 Sct 836-845(1948) Latera v The Isle At Mission Bay Homeowners 655 So 2d, 144(Fla4th DCA1995)Gerber v Long Boat Harbour South 724 F Supp884 It is an excise in sophistry to posit that a court acts as state when enforcing racially restrictive covenants but when giving effort to other provisions of the same covenants they are not state actors.

Goldberg v 400 East Ohio Condominium 12 F3d820 (1998) Statues are state action, "where are the words in Condominium Statue from 1983 ,To say it is not state action until a judge writes a order "Your Honor you can not do what the first amendment states until you write a order to violate the first amendment this undermines the chilling lack of free speech .

Petitioner have court orders in this case stating we are not free citizen not entitled to the bill of rights under the constitution .Petitioners has no right to free speech under federal court order.(App.,infra 53a) Petitioners challenged Don's Porta Signs Inc v City of Clearwater 829 F 2nd 1051 ,1054(11th Cir 1987)Petitioner are not concerned about aesthetic but the flow of free speech and the protection of the Florida and United States Constitution. Court order states Sofarelli v Pinellas County 931 F2d 718,723 (11 th cir 1991) private behavior does raise to state action however the subject of this case is statutory remedy applies under 1983 {every person who subject or causes to be subjected any citizen to the deprivation of any rights by the constitution The people united under the bill of right [a conduct code]there is no longer private action when it comes to the constitution White Egret Condominium 379 So 2d 346Fla 1979No

state action ,age discrimination, Elrod v Burns 427 U.S 347,373-374 96 Sct 2673 ,2690,49 Led 2d547 (1976)Brock v Watergate Park 502 So 2d1380,Fla4th DCA1 ,Dan Glickman v Wileman Brother &Elliott 117 Sct 2130,138 Led [1997]Id.p7,8

IV(D) SUPPRESSION OF MEDICAL RECORDS ,MEDICAL REMOVAL FROM VERDICT FORM, EXPERT THE INTENT OF CONGRESS INJURY UNDER FAIR HOUSING

Respondents Motion In Limine hearsay under rule 8.01 and do not fall under Rule 8.03 citing cases Love v Garcia 634 So 2nd 158 (Fla 1994)Maerck v Birchansky 549 S o 2d 199 199 (Fla 3d DCa 1989)Kelly v State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins 727 So 2d 1145(Fla 5th DCA 1998) Heckford v Florida Department of Corrections 699 So 2d 247(Fla 1st DCA 1997) Belber v Lipson 905 S2nd 549 USCA 1st Id.p62 Id p.63 Early in litigation Respondents' counsel asked Janke and Newbold for release of medical records and physician reports and stated they would send Petitioners 'counsel copies ,nothing arrived ,no disposition taken or contact made with physician. Petitioners' counsel wrote stated medical expert which Janke /Newbold had seen was reviewing all x rays and other Chicago physician report and available in Tampa Florida no contact made by respondents counsel to medical expert.

Petitioner counsel sent all physician report to respondents counsel. **Respondents counsel had no medical expert listed or expert in legal file or present in courtroom** .Respondents ' counsel could have asked any question seating in courtroom waiting room alone with petitioners' expert. Counsel didn't write petitioner asking for anything before trial. Hardly a physician from Chicago would leave his patient to come to Florida .Medical records and x-rays are on large computer disk in Chicago.

Medical expert testimony as in other legal cases **take precedence** as a professional proficient opinion is most important **to a jury** with a developmental person and reason for needing accommodation for Newbold /Janke and to the accident down the stairs .Caretaker provide information to physician and seek professional opinion and nothing wrong speaking in a open courtroom.

V (E)THE INTENT OF CONGRESS ON PERSONAL INJURY UNDER FAIR HOUSING

this is a case of first impression in circuit needing this court opinion

Motion In Limine or summary judgment granted weeks before pretrial conference rather late after petitioner hired expert and completed review of medical records and x-rays.(App., infra 93-96a) Courts cites Justice v Pendleton Place Apartment 40 F 3rd 139 (6th Cir 1994)Franklin v Gwinnett Public Schools 503 U.S 60 (1992) the lower court using traditional negligence was it the first denial or second denial of handicap accommodation petitioners' are challenging under statutory negligence reckless conduct. Petitioners blueprints are moot due to respondents' summary judgment they were never going to approve accommodation because they were not reasonable and refusal to change deed restriction.

As far as the first drawing in September when the county man that approves permits was out on site for this great intersection problem in a rural area they reviewed the entire handicap project ,inspection of location for a simple wooden deck and ramp on crude drawing approved in September seating in county file by county waiting for payment of balance of permit on this small wooden deck and ramp that could have been completed over a weekend .The accident occurred in October. County was surprised with blueprint first by all the detail and approved with three slope option for construction purpose only second because drawing

already approved **It appears that fair housing doesn't define injury for Newbold or Janke who is covered ADA. Bani v Hud 102 F 31203 ,1207 (11th Cir1997) statue provides little guidance beyond other than standing providing for actual damages it doesn't foreclose on physical injury**. Trafficante v Metropolitan Life 409 USC205 93 Sct 364 ,34 Led 2d 415 (1972)U.S of America v Jack Freer 864 F Supp 324 personal injury EEOC vs CEC Entertainment Ada case 10 case No 1593 Young vs Warner Jenkin 8ADA Case 887 **The is the only case that goes into detail of statutory negligence Parker v De Puerto Rico ADA case 10case No 1587 (225 Fed 3d 1 (ist App NY 2000"to act affirmatively to eliminate barrier that otherwise serve to deny person with disabilities access and not merely to excise reasonable care to protect person with disabilities from dangerous condition on premise this is not satisfy the duty merely by exercising reasonable care to protect person with disabilities along with others rather must act affirmatively to eliminate barrier on premise that would otherwise serve to deny person with disabilities .The claim doesn't convert into traditional negligence action but statutory negligence .**

Violation of statue is causation alleged and proven by duty of statue .The physical injury is an addition consequences of the violation of that duty which is of a different than duty to general population .Perhaps strict liability doctrine of res ipsa loquitur the thing speak for itself is actually circumstantial evidence deed restriction . It is a rebuttal presumption or inference that defendants was negligent which arise upon proof that the instrumentality causing the injury was in the control of defendant [deed restriction]it is unnecessary for him or her to demonstrate the exact circumstance because the defendants breach his or her duty of care

VI (F)THE INTENT OF CONGRESS FOR LEGAL PROTECTION

The problem occurred when the lower court granted motion for withdrawn of counsel two weeks before jury trial without hearing or client approval after twenty three thousand dollars paid attorney fees and a lien for twenty thousand dollars this case could not reach a courtroom in a two week period.

Attorney's will take employment discrimination but not a housing case that uses a employment discrimination theory for judgment. Does it matter where discrimination occurred. The lower court was asked to appoint counsel .

What legal protection is available for a Developmental person and family under home base program with a presidential order42 USC 6000-01 ,42USC 10801 ,42 USC 6010under fair housing and civil right case for handicap 42 USC1988 ,42 USC 2000D.

In the middle of a jury trial a rather late period of time a motion granted motion to exclude unauthorized and unlicensed practice of law citing Andrew v Hotel Reed Nursing Home 167 F Supp2d 1333 (U.S DC Ala)Beyer v North Carolina Division Of Mental Health 2001 W.L 1319506(W.D.NC) see Bauer v State Of Florida 610 So 2d1326 (Fla 2d DCA1992)Torrey v Leesburg Regional Medical Center 769 So 2nd 1040 Fla 2000)**A motion granted that hurt not a average physical handicap person** there is a blind severe developmental person where there is a competency issue that can not have her handicap rights protected or heard, a voice for her ,narrative witness or legal rights heard or protected without legal counsel in the middle of jury trial any legal ruling should be default .The petitioner speak for her direct interest as a overall caretaker, dealing daily with the impact of discrimination the harm caused to ward .Whether in a hospital operation and recovery room petitioner becomes Janke voice as she can not speak for

herself as her protector **Petitioner cites Harris v Evans 20 F 3d 1118,1121 (11th Cir all principal of this case applies.**

VII(G) THIS COURT HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED USUAL COURSE JUDICIAL COURT PROCEEDING FOR A FAIR HOUSING/CIVIL RIGHT CASE

After reviewing federal discrimination law litigation and procedures and cited case law by Robert G Schweeman this ruling is in conflict with other appeal and supreme court ruling and court procedures .The law of case doctrine is not inflexible command or a limit on the court as to the review of preliminary injunction (app.,51a) summary judgments order(App.,82a)or seek the intent of congress on a appeal level Oladeinde v City Of Birmingham 230 F3d 1275,1288(11th Cir 2000)Christianson v Colt Industries Operating Corp 486 U.S 800,815 -818 108 Sct 2166,2177-2178,100 Led 2d 811 (1988)Motion have inadequacies as fact finders Malladi v Brown 987 Supp893(M.DAla1997)Summary judgment is improper if plaintiff offer evidence from an inference of retaliation[the need for preliminary injunction that is often given in civil right cases

. The lower court ruled the jury could only hear issues of design of front blueprints which are moot by Respondents summary judgment no other issues would be heard repeated several times with objection granted. Respondent granted motion petitioner not allowed relocation and real estate commission fee and closing cost eleven thousand dollars. Respondents Motion In Limine dated January 23,2002 courtroom reinforcement that facts of the case and conduct for their client be suppress excluding evidence, letters denial due to community rules ,argument ,comments, reference ,and any other facts, jury instruction matters relating to Count I,II,V,VI previously **dispensed with summary judgment conduct** of association and developer and his firm employee and

officers. Everything spoken was somehow related and objection granted. citing Auto -Owners Insurance v Dewberry 383 So 2d 1109 (Fla 1st DCA1980)National Car Rental System v Bostic 423 So 2nd 915 (Fla 3rd DCA1982) Maercks v Birchansky 549So 2nd 199(Fla 3dDCA1989) Pierce v Smith 301 So 2d 805(Fla 2dDCA1974) Sun Supermarket Inc v Fields 568 So 2d480(Fla3rdDCA1990) Skislak v Wilson 422 So2d776(Fla 3rdDCA1985)**Petitioners cite Malladi v Brown 987 F Supp 893 (MDALA1997)Summary Judgment is not proper if plaintiff offer evidence from an inference of retaliation injunction the end of a civil right case.**

b. The jury was told they must find discrimination intent not allowing pretext evidence.

c. Instruction to jury no special treatment for handicap all people are equal

d, Plaintiff in a federal court may use State of Florida Commission On Human Relation Records according to federal discrimination law book denied ,not allowed to speak of commission of the year respondent remain idle and conduct in front of jury or impeach witness's

e According to federal discrimination law book witness are not hearsay residing in the community lower court denied testimony claim hearsay.

Houston v Southern Ry Co37 F 3d 603,605(11th cir 1994) proffered reason were not what actually motivated conduct

Other discriminatory acts in housing ,past filing with commission .Written into federal complaint the developer rezoning of land from commercial to residential for town homes project citied reason for rezoning was due to disabled customer in a county hearing room video ,making jokes of HUD and section 8 housing ,claim able to avoid ADA laws stress handicap law difficulties .

Two other large community that developer wrote deed restriction homeowner filed case with Commission on

Human Relation under fair housing and issues of real estate signs. Jury instruction state modern handicap accommodation elevator or chair lift inside home according to ADA undue hardship major constructions and cost factor. Frankly could not see a developmental person on chair lift and avoid elevator building if possible never addresses power failure. Explain to lower court right of developmental person reply doesn't matter this is a fair housing case, no community approval boards or deed restriction can be used against them

Motion to dismiss Charles M Sasser and Hernando Beach Property Owners Assn granted citing Grubbs v Housing Authority of Joliet cited 1997 WL281297(N.D.ILL) For Association Upholsterers International Union Pension Fund v Artistic Furniture Of Pontiac Appeal Seventh Circuit No89-3058(920 F 2d1323,1990 U.S Appeal Lexis 21428 **Besides other successor cases ,through the case(App.,infra 155-158) Petitioners cites Golden State Bottling Co vs NLRB 414U.S 168,182n5,38L.Ed2d388 ,94Sct414 (1973)** Sattefield v Wal Mart 135 F3d973 1998 U.S App 5thCirLexis 2960pg 6**23 Rojas v TK Communication 87 F 3rd 745 *1996 5th Cir AppLexis 17428 Id, pg 4,*15-17 Id ,pg5 Worth vTyler,II U.S title &Abstract Grundy County Title 2001 U.S App 7th cir Lexis 27212 Id pg 5 *17-18 **Besides other cases cited on employment discrimination , federal fair housing cases according to Federal discrimination litigation, laws and procedures but also stress this is a civil rights case and laws and liability should be applied. Petitioners cite City of Chicago v Matchmaker Real E 982 F 2d 1086 (7th cir 1992) (App.,infra 83a ,157a)Wyatt v Cole 504 U.S 158 112 Sct1827,118 Led ,Forrester vs White 484 U.S 210 108 Sct 538 98 Led 2nd 5559(1998) U.S Sea Wind of Marco893 F Supp1051 U.S v American Key Bank National Assoc Lexis 199 U.S Dist Lexis 14651 Harlow v Fitzgerald 457 U.S 800,818 102Sct 2727,2738,73 Led 2d 396 (1982)Gebserv**

Lago Vista Indep School Dist 524 U.S 274 ,283-291 ,118 Sct 1989,1996-2000

Defendants could not have been motivated by knowledge didn't have Mc kinnon vs Nashville Banner Pub Co 513 U.S 352,360 ,115 Sct 879,885,130 Led 2nd 82 [1995]Reeves v Plumbing Co 120 Sct 2097,2108Didn't have the knowledge of facts stated on summary judgment it was not until July 2000respondents were aware of information according to Sasser disposition they never took measurement , never contacted the county or blueprint designer, asked for permit or notify petitioner verbal or written or even walk across the street at the time of denial with this recent pretest slope safety theory patronizing and insincere concern given to the jury if such a concern why on earth would Charles M Sasser Jr communicated those concerns to Loren or at her disposition

.But in a lame attempt Charles M Sasser to avoid liability arrived in court didn't know why he was in court told jury they would have approved front accommodation but concerned about slope safety as that was the case all along as if it happen week petitioner had to remain silent

Conclusion: For the foregoing reason ,petitioner ask that a writ of certiorari should be granted if this erroneous ruling is allowed to stand a great injustice will have occurred Judges and lay jurors will create havoc with the intent of congress, Since most community are deed restricted in the State Of Florida it will impact interstate senior and disabled retiree that go to the State of Florida as will as impact housing for disabled, impairs stability and uniformity of case law , . This petition address the issue of personal injury under fair housing the victim perhaps without medical insurance .Respectfully submitted on this day 20th of Feburuary,2003

Pro -se Litigants Nicole Loren Nicole Loren 8219 W Addison St Chicago Illinois 60634 (773-598-1422)